

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6-8 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2002/0097247 (“Ohba”); of the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over Ohba in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,899 (“Lee”); and of the rejection of Claims 9-14, as being obvious over Ohba in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,331,856 (“Nakamura”).

It is respectfully submitted that Ohba fails to teach or suggest “means for executing predetermined processing when the detecting means detects the virtual touches that are made to a predetermined number of touch points in a predetermined order,” as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly in independent Claims 7 and 8.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ohba fails to teach or suggest that “the analyzing means analyzes the video image when each of the plurality of images, that prompts the input, is displayed, and detects that an area of the video image, corresponding to the selected area displayed in the manner different from others, includes a predetermined image; and a predetermined function is executed when production of the image that prompts the input, and the detection that the corresponding area includes the predetermined image, are performed a predetermined number of times,” as recited in independent Claim 6.

Independent Claims 1, 7, and 8 are directed to an information processing system to execute a processing when a plurality of predetermined number of touch points are touched in a predetermined order by virtual touches. Further, independent Claim 6 is directed to an entertainment system to execute a predetermined function when one of a plurality of areas is

displayed in a manner different from others, a detection that a selected area is displayed in a manner different from others, and an area corresponding to a picked up video image includes a predetermined image, is performed a plurality of times.

In contrast, although Ohba appears to disclose that a menu or a color of flame image is determined according to a cumulative sum of their difference values, Ohba does not teach or suggest determining whether or not movements according to a predetermined order in a plurality of points are detected, and displaying one point among a plurality of points in a manner different from others (in order to indicate a point to be touched next).

Further, dependent Claims 9, 13 and 14 are directed to displaying an object that connects touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches.

In contrast, although Nakamura appears to disclose that a motion command is shown by an arrow, this arrow is used to display a moving direction of a player and can be displayed irrespective of detection of an operation device on a tambourine-shaped mark. Nakamura does not teach or suggest displaying touch points connected sequentially subjected to the virtual touches.

Lee does not cure the deficiencies of Ohba and Nakamura.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 6-8, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over the cited references, alone or in any possible combination.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Pedro C. Fernandez/
Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6311

Fax: (212) 940-8986

Docket No.: SCET 22.664 (100809-00339)

PCF:fd